

## REMARKS

In the Office action the Examiner has determined that the application contains inventions or groups of inventions that are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. The Examiner has required applicants to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted, and has identified Group I, claims 1-15 and Group II, claims 16-20. The Examiner has further determined that separate species are provided in the application, and has required applicant to elect a single species for prosecution on the merits.

In response to the restriction/election requirement, applicants elect, with traverse, claims 1-15 and, further, elect the species of Fig. 3. It is submitted that claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13 read on Fig. 3. The Examiner's restriction/election requirement is traversed for the following reasons.

Although the Examiner has cited to the PCT Rules, applicant hereby submits that the Examiner has not applied the appropriate standard in determining whether more than one invention is presented by the claims of the present application. In this regard it is noted that restriction practice in the U.S. is not directly related to unity practice under the PCT. It is further noted that species/genus practice in the U.S. does not exist in international applications, is entirely contrary to unity of invention practice, and cannot be applied to national stage applications in the U.S.

Initially, it is noted that the "unity" of the claims was implicitly acknowledged during the international phase by the ISA and the IPEA. Accordingly, it is submitted that under Article 27 of the PCT and 37 CFR 1.475, the USPTO cannot now properly require restriction. For this reason alone, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and withdraw the pending restriction requirement.

Further, according to PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2, the unity requirement is met if a group of inventions is linked so as to form a general inventive concept – i.e., that there is a technical relationship among the inventions. The inventions have to share one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" means those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

In the present application is directed toward an improved printed circuit construction and manufacturing method wherein the power conductor tracks are

manufactured to be thicker than the signal conductor tracts. Each of the claims of the present application includes this common technical feature: the existence or preparation of signal conductor tracks and power conductor tracks with differing thicknesses. Accordingly, for at least this further reason it is submitted that the unity of invention requirement is satisfied.

Finally, the Examiner's attention is directed toward 37 CFR 1.475, which states (in part):

b) An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

In the present case it is considered apparent that, under 37 CFR 1.475(b), the claims of the present application do, indeed, satisfy the unity of invention requirement since the claims are directed toward "A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product". In this regard it is submitted that, while the Examiner's statement that "the method for manufacturing a multi-chip module can be used in vary processes" may be relevant for U.S. restriction practice, it is entirely irrelevant to determination of unity of invention. For at least this further reason, restriction of the application to one of the product or method claims is not required.

With regard to the Examiner's requirement that applicants elect a single species for prosecution on the merits, it is submitted that this requirement is improper in the present national stage application, which is governed by unity of invention practice. Insofar as claims 2-14 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, claims 1-15 must, by definition, satisfy the unity of invention requirement. Accordingly, withdrawal of the election requirement is requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-20 satisfy the unity of invention requirement. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction/election requirement is requested.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. FRR-12671.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By   
David E. Spaw, Reg. No. 34732

700 Huntington Building  
925 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1405  
(216) 566-9700  
Customer No. 007609